

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U. S. Application No. 09/840,467

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, with regard to the Examiner's statement on the inapplicability of the AIPA, Applicant respectfully submits that all applicable art should be deemed to have been considered in the prosecution of this application.

Claims 1-7 are all the claims pending in the application.

In response to the Amendment filed March 19, 2003, the Examiner removed all of the previous claim rejections. The current status of the claims is the following.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by newly-cited Hanaya et al. (US 6,519,009, hereafter "Hanaya"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as set forth below.

Hanaya relates to a program switching device and a method thereof for use in receiving a digital television broadcast based on electronic program guide information which is, for example, broadcast via a satellite and in switching the broadcast channel program.

With regard to claim 2, Applicant submits that Hanaya does not teach or suggest an OSD source for transmitting a plurality of OSD multi cursor display data by giving each OSD multi cursor display data a peculiar ID and transmitting a selected OSD multi cursor ID and display location information in the case that there is an OSD multi cursor display command from said OSD source remote controller. The Examiner asserts that col. 11, lines 5-16 of Hanaya disclose an OSD source for transmitting a plurality of OSD multi cursor display data by giving each OSD multi cursor display data a peculiar ID. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited excerpt states:

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U. S. Application No. 09/840,467

Each channel data contains a channel number representing the number of the channel, a channel name representing a call sign (name) of a broadcast station, a logo ID for identifying a logo of a broadcast station, data IDs for identifying the MPEG video data and the MPEG audio data, the number of programs representing the number of programs the channel (for example, channel 1) has, and a first program's offset representing an offset value from a place (an address) where the first program data of a predetermined channel is memorized (for, example, in the case of channel 2, the start of a program segment (the start of program 1-1 in the case of FIG. 12) until an address where the initial program data program 2-1 is memorized).

The cited excerpt does not disclose giving each OSD multi cursor display data a peculiar ID. Rather, the excerpt discloses that a logo ID is used to identify the logo of a broadcast station, and the MPEG video and audio data have data IDs. Applicant submits that neither of these IDs are OSD multi cursor display data. Furthermore, the excerpt does not indicate that each of a plurality of OSD multi cursor display data are given a peculiar ID.

Moreover, the Examiner has not identified a portion of Hanaya as allegedly disclosing the feature of transmitting a selected OSD multi cursor ID and display location information in the case that there is an OSD multi cursor display command from said OSD source remote controller, as required by claim 2. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner either identify a specific portion of the reference that allegedly discloses this feature of claim 2, or remove the rejection.

With further regard to claim 2, Applicant submits that Hanaya fails to teach or suggest a display apparatus for storing the plurality of OSD multi cursor display data received from the OSD source in a memory and reading an OSD multi cursor display data having a corresponding ID from the memory and displaying the OSD multi cursor display data on a screen at a given display location in response to the received OSD multi cursor ID and display location

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U. S. Application No. 09/840,467

information. The Examiner refers to col. 12, lines 9-19 and 45-52, and col. 10, lines 41-47, as allegedly disclosing these features of claim 2. However, each of the cited excerpts actually describe the integrated receiver/decoder (IRD) 2, not a display apparatus. The cited excerpts disclose how the IRD 2 processes the data, which is subsequently transmitted to the monitor device 4. In Hanaya, the IRD 2 transmits data to the monitor device 4, in a manner that appears to correspond to that from which the present invention is distinguished, i.e., transmitting OSD display data to the monitor device 4 each time the data is desired, rather than transmitting an OSD multi cursor ID and display location information.

Therefore, claim 2 and its dependent claims 3-7 are not anticipated by Hanaya, for at least the above-noted reasons.

Regarding claim 3, Applicant further submits that Hanaya does not teach or suggest an MPEG source for supplying an MPEG transport stream to the display apparatus. Instead, the reference discloses that an MPEG signal is decoded in the IRD 2 by MPEG video decoder 25 and MPEG audio decoder 26. Thus, an MPEG transport stream is not supplied to the monitor device 4. Rather, the decoded video signal is supplied to an NTSC encoder 27, the signals from which are then supplied to the monitor device 4 in the NTSC method. See col. 6, lines 7-16 and FIG. 4. Hence, claim 3 is allowable for this additional reason.

With further regard to claim 5, Hanaya fails to teach or suggest a display apparatus that includes an MPEG decoder for decoding an MPEG transport stream and outputting image data. The Examiner cited the MPEG video decoder 25 of Hanaya as allegedly corresponding to the claimed MPEG decoder. However, the MPEG video decoder 25 is part of the IRD 2, not the monitor device 4, which is not disclosed as having an MPEG decoder. Furthermore, since the

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U. S. Application No. 09/840,467

IRD 2 has an MPEG decoder and an MPEG transport stream is not transmitted to the monitor device 4, there is no need or use for an MPEG decoder in the monitor device 4 of Hanaya. Thus, claim 5 is allowable over the prior art for this reason also.

With respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable over the prior art for reasons analogous to those presented above in relation to claim 2.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Cameron W. Beddard
Cameron W. Beddard
Registration No. 46,545

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 2, 2003